P7

G.O. 11

19 35

Department of L. R. Sett.

OFFICE Board of Rev.

STATION Madras

Mi No. 2932

Dated 5-8-35

DESPATCHED
7-AUG 1935

Pages in the file

(SUBJECT.)

Sitt - Resitt - (South Kanara) -
Karkal TK - Durga village
S. No 197/4 - Reclassification
grounds - Appeal dismissed

BOARD OF REVENUE
MADRAS
5-JUL 1935
LAND REVENUE AND SETTLEMENT

RP 36
CFR^a 2 F 24 6 W

To
The Commissioner of Land Revenue
and Settlement, Madras.

Humble petition from Madhusoodana Bhatta Son of Vyasa Bhat, residing at Kalaje, Durga village, No. 29, Karkal Taluk.

South Kanara District.

Ref. Resettlement :— Reclassification of dry lands into garden in Durga village No. 29 Karkal Taluk. South Kanara District. S. Nos. $\frac{197}{4}$, $\frac{4}{3}$, $\frac{4}{8}$ $\frac{4}{9}$ and 162. Injustice done by the Settlement staff. Partiality shown to the adjacent owner of the lands of the petitioner. S. No $\frac{197}{4}$ and low rates imposed when higher rate can be imposed. Prays for enquiry.

Dated 27.6.35

Respected Sirs,

I am the registered holder of lands covered by Patta No 53 in Durga village (No 29) Karkal Taluk.

S. No $\frac{197}{4}$ was dry land before It was classified as 7.5.6 and assessed at 8 eight annas per acre. Now it has been classified as

II I. A

P.C. to petr for authenticated & duly stamped copy of S. A-S.'s order submitted. Returnable by 5-8-35.

garden and assessed at Rs 2-4-0 per acre on that ground that there are 4 jack trees and 2 pepper vines. The trees yield fruits only once in some years and the pepper vines are of wild variety and are not in a good condition. I applied to the Settlement Tahsildar to reduce the rate and restore the land to the original classification; But the petition was rejected by him without holding a local inspection of the property. Then I appealed to the Assistant Settlement Officer, Party No 3 Mangalore. He came to the locality and inspected only S. No $\frac{197}{4}$ belonging to me. I requested him to inspect the surrounding gardens, which were assessed at lower rates when they deserved imposition of higher rates —

The properties described hereinbelow which are just adjacent or near the lands belonging to me have been assessed at the old settlement as follows. —

S. No. $\frac{4}{3}$ dry 7·3·4 at Re 1-0-0
S. No. $\frac{4}{8}$ do - 7·2·3 at Re 1-4-0
S. No $\frac{4}{9}$ do - 8·3·5 at Re 0-12-0
S. No 162 do - 7·4·5 at Re 0-12-0

At the Resettlement they have been assessed as follows

S. No $\frac{4}{3}$ dry 7·3·4 at Rs 1-0-0

S. No $\frac{4}{8}$ garden 7·2·7 at Rs 2-4-0

S. No $\frac{4}{9}$ garden 8·3·6 at Rs 3-6-0

S. No. 162 garden 7·4·7. at Rs 2-4-0.

Most of them are arecanut gardens. The adjacent gardens have been assessed at Rs 7 or 8 The land described above deserves imposition of assessment at Rs 8 per acre. There is no justification whatsoever under the Settlement rules and principles for the levying of low rate of assessment for these lands. The owner of these lands is a rich and influential land-lord and I am inclined to believe that he must have been influenced for the levying of low rate of assessment for these lands. My lands have no water facilities. The properties described above is lower than my lands. They have got perrenial supply of water throughout the year. The water flows freely into these lands. The properties consist of paddy fields, jack, Cocoanut, arecanut, plantain. S. No 162 is described

in the Revenue Register as consisting of 5-5 acres. But the government land has been encroached upon and the plot now really is about 8 to 10 acres in extent. If a local inspection of the properties are made I can point out the gross injustice and partiality shown by the lesser officials of the Settlement department. They have fixed the rate of assessment which is most unsuitable to the soil and condition of the land and caused loss to Government in levying lower rate of assessment to (the) lands which deserved higher rate. This I will prove at local inspection.

I therefore most humbly pray that your Honours may be pleased to direct local inspection of properties at an early date and levy proper and just assessment to all the lands mentioned above including that of mine. Notice of local inspection may be served upon me and the officer who inspected the locality may be directed to accompany

the inspecting officer A Copy of this petition has been Communicated to the District — Collector for necessary action Errors excepted

I beg to remain Sir,

Your most obedient servant

[illegible]

7

CF 2081 R.P. 61
F. 27

BOARD OF REVENUE
MADRAS
22 JUL 1935
LAND REVENUE AND SETTLEMENT

From

M. R. Rg.
Madhusoodana Bhatta Aul Son of Kalje
Vyasa Bhatta, of Durga village, Kartal
Taluk.

To

The Commissioner of Land Revenue
and Settlement. Madras.

As per Order No F2461/35 - dated 1.7.35.
An authenticated and duly stamped Copy
of the S.A.S.O's order appealed against is
enclosed herewith. This may be accepted as
part of the record of my appeal.

Durga
19.7.35

Your most obedient Servant

Enclosure

31.5 1935 Copy of the order of the Special
assistant Settlement Officer
in Charge

L.Dis.1467-35.

Revenue Settlement Office,
Party No.III, Mangalore,
Dated 31st. May 1935.

M.R.Ry. K.P.Krishnan Nayar Avl., B.A.,
Special Assistant Settlement Officer in Charge.

Proceedings:--

Settlement -- Resettlement -- Reclassification -- Karkal taluk -- Village Ni.29 Durga -- S.No.197/4 -- Appeal.

Read:- (i) petition from Madhusudana Bhat received on 29-4-35.

(ii) C.No.97/Sup.35 dated 9-5-35 of the Settlement Tahsildar, Karkal.

(iii) Settlement Tahsildar's order appealed against: C.No.84/P 35 dated 11-3-35 and the connected ~~records~~. papers.

O r d e r:-

I have inspected the land. The petitioner's contenti that it 'contains no bearing garden trees except a few young 'non bearing areca and coco plants' is ~~untrue.~~ untrue. As noted by the Settlement Inspector there are four jacks in this plot three of whic even now contain fruits. The jacks and pepper vines have been shown to the petitioner who says that the statement that there are no gard trees was wrongly made in the petition by the petition~~er~~ writer.

The land adjoins and has been enclosed with an areca garden assessed at Rs.9/- Its extent being only 52 cents, the trees are more than sufficient for its registry as garden and the rate imposed, namely, Rs.2-4-0 is not at all high. The appeal is dismiss

K.P.Krishnan Nayar
for Special Assistant Settlement Officer in Charge

To

DESPATCHED
5 JUN 1935

The appellant.
Copy to the Settlement Tahsildar, Karkal with his file C.No.84/Ptm.35 returned.

Madhusudana Bhat,
Durga Village
Karkal Taluk

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL.

	Date.	Initials.
When received for fair copying ..		
When copied ..		
When examined ..		
When signed ..		
When despatched.		

SUBJECT:—

Satti - Basti (South Kanara) - Karkal taluk - Durga village - S. No. 197/4 - Reclassification as garden - Appeal ~~rejected~~ dismissed

READ AGAIN _____, dated _____ 19____.

" " _____ " _____ 19____.

READ *ALSO*:—

No. _____ From the _____, No. _____ dated _____ 9

" _____ " _____ " _____ " _____ 19____.

" _____ " _____ " _____ " _____ 19____.

~~Order~~ / Resolution ~~Ms.~~ / ~~Rout.~~ No. 2932, dated 5 8 1935

From the S. A. S. O.'s order appealed against the Board observes that the field has been rightly classed as garden. The rate of assessment levied is only Rs 2-4-0 per acre. The Board sees no reason to interfere with the S. A. S. O.'s order and the appeal is accordingly ~~rejected~~ dismissed

Sitt — Resitt (South Kanara) — Karkal taluk
Durga village — S. No. 197/4 —
Reclassification as garden.
Appeal.

J. 2461/35 — pp 1-5 c.f.

To A.S. (Sitt)

Please the petition at pp 1-5 c.f. appealing against the order of the S.A.S.O. d. 31-5-35 rejecting the petitioner's request to reclassify S. 197/4 as dry. The petition was received on 5-7-35 & within time.

The field is 0.52 acs in extent. The S.A.S.O.'s order at page 9 c.f. shows that it contains 4 jack trees of which three are bearing besides pepper vines. Under the rules for the reclassification of dry lands as garden, this field has to be classified as garden as there are three bearing jack trees equivalent to 6 coconut trees besides pepper vines. The rate imposed is only Rs 2.4-0 per acre & the P.A.S.O. who has inspected the field states that the rate is not at all high. A perusal of the appeal petition would show that ~~his~~ the petitioner's grievance is not so much

against the rate imposed on his land as against the low rates levied by the sett. staff on adjacent garden lands and their failure to book encroachments made by adjacent land-holders. The appeal may be dismissed.

For orders

29-7-35
30/7/35

J.S.
30/7

To A.S. (Sett)

Draft submd.

3-8.
2/8/35

6/5-8-35